1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
10		
11		
12	CECIL DUDGEON,	CASE NO. C09-5200RBL/JRC
13	Plaintiff,	ORDER ON PENDING
14	v.	MOTIONS
15	DR. HENRY RICHARDS et al.,	
16	Defendants.	
17		
18 19		
	This 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge	
20	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 636 (b) (1) (A) and 636 (b) (1) (B) and Local Magistrates Judges' Rules	
21 22	MJR 1, MJR 3, and MJR 4. The matter is before the Court on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss	
23	(Dkt. # 14). Plaintiff has responded and agrees that the complaint he submitted is deficient (Dkt.	
24	# 17). In the response plaintiff asks for leave to file an amended complaint. Defendants replied	
25	(Dkt. # 21).	

The Ninth Circuit has repeatedly stated that dismissal of a complaint without giving the

plaintiff the opportunity to amend is reversible error unless amendment could not cure the defect.

"Assuming a substantive or jurisdictional defect in the pleadings, '[d]ismissal without leave to amend is proper only if it is clear, upon de novo review, that the complaint could not be saved by any amendment." Swartz v. KPMG LLP, 476 F.3d 756 (9th Cir. 2007).

The Court is not sure that amendment can cure the defects in the complaint, but, plaintiff's request to file an amended complaint is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff will have until September 4, 2009 to file his amended complaint. After review of the amended complaint, defendants may re-note their Motion to Dismiss, or they may file any other motion or answer they deem appropriate. No discovery will be allowed until the Court has a viable complaint before it.

The Clerk of Court is directed to note the September 4, 2009, due date and remove the Motion to Dismiss, (Dkt. # 14), from the Court's calendar.

Dated this 10th day of August, 2009.

J. Richard Creatura

United States Magistrate Judge